



Board of County Commissioners

Kevin Ruane
District One

March 28, 2025

Cecil L Pendergrass
District Two

David Mulicka
District Three

Brian Hamman
District Four

Mike Greenwell
District Five

Dave Harner, II
County Manager

Richard Wm. Wesch
County Attorney

Donna Marie Collins
County Hearing
Examiner

Jem Frantz, AICP
RVi Planning + Landscape Architecture
28100 Boonita Grande Dr., Suite 305
Bonita Springs, FL 34135
Via E-mail Only: jfrantz@rviplanning.com

RE: CPA2024-00016

Caloosa 80 Map Amendments, Second Review

Dear Ms. Frantz:

Staff has reviewed the application for a Lee Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Amendment resubmittal stamped "received" on February 25, 2025. The planning staff finds that the application materials are insufficient and require additional information for review.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

1. Some of these comments are new and based on the PD submittal, which was not submitted to the Zoning Section until after the previous round of comments from the CPA submittal had been sent.
2. According to the response to Policy 124.1.1, there are a total of 8.74 acres of wetlands on the subject property. Ensure that the density calculations for the companion rezone reflect the combination of Urban Community, Sub-Outlying Suburban, and Wetlands.

PLANNING COMMENTS

3. The application narrative states that there will be an 80-foot buffer along Bateman Road on page 3; however, a 40-foot buffer is specified along Hickey Creek Mitigation Park/Bateman Road in all other references. Revise all references to the correct, consistent buffer size.
4. The response to Lee Plan Policy 1.1.11 on page 5 states that the property is located in a suburban area of the county. The Lee Plan designates the Urban Community FLUC as a Future Urban Area and the existing Rural FLUC as a Future Non-Urban Area. The majority of this area of the county is in Future Non-Urban Areas, as defined by the Lee Plan. Clarify the response to differentiate between the Lee Plan definitions of Urban/Suburban/Non-Urban and the existing development pattern along Palm Beach Blvd.

5. The response to Standard 4.1.1, Water, is included on page 6; however, there was no response to Standard 4.1.2, Sewer. Add a response to Lee Plan Standards 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 to the Lee Plan Analysis.
6. The response to Lee Plan Policy 5.1.5 on page 7 incorrectly states that the sub-outlying suburban FLUC does not permit commercial uses. Additionally, nothing in the Community Plan Areas would limit the commercial to neighborhood commercial uses. Revise the response accordingly.
7. The response to Policy 28.2.2 requires the applicant to submit a companion Planned Development rezone to ensure compatibility with the surrounding development. The applicant's response to this policy in the Lee Plan Analysis states the following:
 - a. *Impacts to existing wetlands on the Property are minimized through establishment of preserve areas...*
 - b. *The proposed development will be clustered to ensure adequate open space on the Property...*
 - c. *While there is a proposed increase in density to allow for financial feasibility of the project, the change to the Sub-Outlying Suburban designation only creates an increase of 93 units across the 192.3 +/- project... This designation would allow for densities to gradually decrease from Urban Community to the adjoining Rural.*

The companion rezoning's MCP does not depict the description of the proposed development provided for this policy. As previously noted, approximately half of the existing wetlands will not be preserved, and the preserve areas account for only 13% of the site's total area. While the MCP places the townhouse portion of the development on the Urban Community portion of the site, the development pattern across the site is relatively dense compared to the surrounding community and consistent across the property in rectangular blocks. Additionally, the increase of 93 units across the site doubles the density allowed within the proposed sub-outlying suburban portion, which is not insignificant. The sub-outlying suburban FLUC would create a step-down approach to density from the Urban Community FLUC; however, the proposed development pattern does not mirror this change. Consider an alternative approach to addressing the proposed development's rural character and compatibility with the surrounding area, or redesign the MCP to meet the provided descriptions.

8. The response to Goal 61 states that the proposed development includes over 20 acres of lakes; however, the MCP shows only 18.67 acres of lakes. Revise the response to be consistent with the proposal.
9. The proposed allocation changes to Table 1(b) result in an increased population accommodation based on assumptions derived from census data and development patterns specific to each planning district, as well as future land use designations within each planning district. The reduction of 192 acres in the rural land use designation on Table 1(b) will reduce the future residential development within Planning District 1 in the areas designated Rural to less than 200 acres. Staff recommends the applicant make the following modifications to Table 1(b) within Planning District 1:
 - a. Add 44 acres to Sub-Outlying Suburban
 - b. Reduce Urban Community by 22.25 acres (would round to 22 acres on the table)
 - c. Reduce Rural by 5 acres (the previous MCP placed the transient units within the Rural land use designation).
 - d. Add 17 acres to the non-regulatory Public category.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION COMMENTS

10. The application indicates only a portion of the property will be re-designated to Sub-Outlying Suburban. Provide a metes and bounds description of the proposed change.

TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS

11. The uses for trip generation shall be a worst-case scenario for the proposed land use category. Since this application is a companion MPD rezoning application that further limits the development of the property to 721 dwelling units and up to 30,000 square feet of neighborhood commercial uses, the trip generation uses for the CPA application shall be consistent with those in the rezoning application.

12. Please provide the sources of the K & D factors in the analysis.

13. The existing traffic volumes shall be from the County's latest concurrency report.

14. The service volumes for SR 80 are outdated and shall be updated from FDOT's 2023 Multimodal Quality/Level of Service Handbook.

Public hearings will not be scheduled until a complete application is submitted. If you do not provide the requested supplements of corrections within 90 days of this letter, this application will be considered withdrawn. Feel free to contact Planning staff at (239) 533-8362 or kburgess@leegov.com with any questions.

Respectfully,

Lee County Department of Community Development



Kate Burgess AICP
Principal Planner, Planning Section

Cc: Case File